

Announcements.

DAKIN, CRICKSHANK & COMPANY, LIMITED.
VICTORIA DISPENSARY.

COLDS IN THE HEAD, &c.
BURROUGHS WELLCOME & Co.'s
PINOL EUCALYPTA INHALERS.

ONE of the best remedies extant for Nasal Catarrh and all disorders of the Nasal Passages and Nasopharyngeal membranes.
Price\$1.25.

EUCALYPTUS OIL.
A STANDARD REMEDY FOR COLDS.
Sprinkled on the handkerchief and over the breast of the night clothing it gives almost instant relief.
Bottles\$1.00 and 50 Cents.

DAKIN, CRICKSHANK & Co., Ltd.,
VICTORIA DISPENSARY.
Hongkong, 10th January, 1895.

A. S. WATSON & CO., LIMITED.
ESTABLISHED A.D. 1841.

WINES AND SPIRITS.

All these are selected by our London House, bought direct at first hand, imported in Wood and Bottled by ourselves, thus saving all intermediate profits and enabling us to supply the best products at moderate prices.

PRICE LIST, WITH FULL DETAILS, TO BE HAD ON APPLICATION.

PORT.—After removal should be rested a month before use. When required for medicinal purposes it should be ordered to be decanted at the Dispensary before being sent out.

SHERRY.—Excellent dinner and after dinner wine, of very superior vintage. All are now at a low price.

CLARET.—Our Claret, including the lowest quality, is guaranteed to be the genuine product of the vine of the grape and are not adulterated with any other ingredients, and are generally the case with Cheap Wines.

BRANDY.—All our Brandy is guaranteed to be pure Cognac, the difference in price being merely a question of age and vintage.

WHISKY.—All our Whisky is of excellent quality and of greater age than most brands in the market. The Scotch Whisky marked "A" is universally popular and is produced by the best local distillers and is superior to any other brand in the Hongkong Market.

We only guarantee our Wines and Spirits to be genuine when bought direct from us in the Colony or from our authorised Agents at the Coast Ports.

A. S. WATSON & CO., LD.
THE HONGKONG DISPENSARY.
Hongkong, 9th January, 1895.

The Hongkong Telegraph

HONGKONG, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 1895.

THE NEW SANITARY BYE-LAWS.

The last number of the *Government Gazette* contains an announcement of interesting matter, which we have been waiting for some time. We have, it is true, already given our columns the substance and many particulars of the reports published in the *Gazette*, but they have now been presented in complete form, making it fuller and more intelligible. (For the present the subject to which we wish specially to call our readers' attention is the complete code of the new Sanitary Bye-Laws, made under section 13 of Ordinance 15 of 1894. These bye-laws contain thirty-one clauses and are intended to provide an efficient means of protecting the city from the spread of fatal diseases. These bye-laws, as our readers will remember, have been worked out with great care by the Sanitary Board, as our reports during the past eight months of its many meetings, in discussion of the clauses, has already shown. Doubtless these provisions are not absolutely perfect, but they are probably as nearly so as the complex questions involved will permit; and with some slight modifications, that time and experience may suggest and approve, they will be found to be a well-developed, equitable and practical system of sanitary laws, such as has been rare in fixed municipalities not to have had from the beginning. We think our examining these provisions with care will admit that the Sanitary Board and the Legislative Council are entitled to great credit for the patient, persistent, careful work they have devoted to this gigantic task. No doubt the first operation of these provisions among certain classes will cause considerable friction, for even great reforms when entailing a serious disturbance of a fixed condition of things are temporarily more or less of a hardship. In this instance, these difficulties are still more accentuated and diversified by the peculiar race complications that we have to deal with in our colony. Nearly the entire population is unfamiliar with the English language. They neither read our papers nor our books; attend no public meetings, come in no way in contact with our English-speaking citizens. Wholly they have shown sufficient confidence in the integrity and good faith of the British Government to settle in large numbers in Victoria and have here located great wealth in fixed investments, yet they never feel perfectly sure of their future rights, and naturally always view with some distrust changes which entail expense, inconvenience, and possibly some loss of profit. They do not value so greatly as European nations a high degree of

care for human life and property, among the lower classes, and they do not sympathize with too much zeal shown for the welfare of the cooler. Accustomed themselves to good living, and trained in the methods of avoiding contagion from their surrounding city, they prefer to take their chances of contracting disease rather than to spend money in bettering the condition of the poor, even if thereby minimizing the possibilities of infection. This subject might be profitably discussed at length, but we have, we think, said sufficient to give an idea why the changes made necessary by the new sanitary laws will naturally meet with considerable opposition, especially from the more avaricious landlords and from the many unprincipled coiled lodging-house keepers, and from others of a similar character who have been earning undue profits in an illegal way by overcrowding their premises in disregard of all laws of cleanliness and in utter disregard of the general health and welfare of the community. It is no wonder that such classes of individuals view with alarm the new Sanitary Bye-laws and try to fight the coiled lodges into believing that the registration of the lodging-houses and the provisions of the new bye-laws are simply means for imposing special taxes on the poor coiled. The falsehoods that these unscrupulous lodging-house keepers and others are circulating are chiefly responsible for the present strike, and for the difficulties thus far placed in the way of the enforcement of the new Bye-laws.

The Bye-laws, although very plainly expressed, are naturally of a somewhat technical nature requiring careful reading and study to comprehend their full meaning. It is not our purpose here to enter upon a discussion of the separate clauses. They provide, in a general way, for proper construction of buildings, and wherever kitchen, latrine, slop, or any objectionable matter is to be handled, they also provide for proper drains and ventilation and sufficient cubic space for sleeping rooms in proportion to the number of people using the same by night; they also provide for the disposal of refuse matter and for the maintenance of a generally decent condition of buildings and their surroundings, and for reasonable and permanent sanitary state of the entire city. The Board has, however, wisely made the specifications and penalties under which these regulations are to be carried out reasonably elastic and has reserved to itself a certain right in many provisions to vary the exact letter of the law, as long as a substantial agreement with its spirit is shown; and it must be evident to any fair-minded man that a Board composed of men of the eminence and character and disinterested devotion of our Sanitary Board will always give the largest justice possible demanded by the special circumstances of each exceptional case. We warmly commend these excellent bye-laws to the hearty co-operation of all citizens and residents who have the welfare of the colony at heart; and we feel sure that, if the efforts of the Sanitary Board receive proper support and if it appears they are at present—Hongkong will soon be in a commendable sanitary condition, and will never have again to chronicle such a disastrous epoch as that of the "plague year" of 1894.

TELEGRAMS.

THE EMPEROR OF GERMANY AND PRINCE BISMARCK.
LONDON, March 27th.
The Emperor William has paid a visit to Prince Bismarck at Friedrichsruh and ordered a review of all his army. The Emperor thanked Prince Bismarck for his services to Germany in front of the troops, and during luncheon at the Castle drank a toast to the Prince, which was followed by a salute of 21 guns.

THE LINCOLNSHIRE HANDICAP.
The LINCOLNSHIRE HANDICAP of 1,000 sovs., added to a sweepstakes of 20 sovs. each, 10 f. unless declared, for three years olds and up, 1895, the winner of any handicap after February 21, at noon, to carry 5 lb., of two, or one value 200 sovs., 7 lb. of one value 500 sovs., 10 lb. extra; the second to receive 500 sovs. out of the stakes; entrance 5 sovs., 500 sovs. only forfeit if declared; the Straight Mile; 69 subs.
The result of the Lincolnshire Handicap is as follows:
Euclid 1
El Diablo 2
Amindler 3

(Special to N. C. Daily News.)
CHANG YING-HUAN IN PEKING.
PEKING, March 27th.
Chang Ying-huan, since his return to Peking during the last six days has had three Imperial audiences, and has been striving to aid Li Tung-chang. His counsel has been much sought, and in consequence a new request has been made to the European Powers to interpose for immediate peace.

A JAPANESE VESSEL ASHORE.
SHANHA KUAN, March 27th.
On the night of the 26th a great snow-storm and high wind, a small steamer (2 tons) belonging to the Japanese ran ashore near Fanchien on the sea coast. Two men were drowned. This morning the soldiers tried to capture the steamer, but eight others came to the rescue and towed her off. Chinese troops (one battalion) at Fanchien used only muskets, having no field pieces, otherwise the disabled steamer could have been easily destroyed. The Chinese suffered no loss, only one man being wounded. The enemy used machine guns while towing the small steamer away.

LOCAL AND GENERAL.

COLLARD & COLLARD PIANOS at W. Robinson & Co.

A MEETING of the Sanitary Board will be held to-morrow at 4.15 p.m.

LATEST share quotations will be found under the head-line "Share List" on the fourth page of this issue.

THE O. & O. S. S. Co's steamer *Gaika*, with mail, &c., from San Francisco to the 5th Inst. via Yokohama, has arrived at Nagasaki, and left for this port this morning at 6 o'clock.

THE thirteenth ordinary annual meeting of shareholders of the Luxon Sugar Refining Co., Ltd., will be held at the General Agents' office, Pedder's Street, at 12.30 p.m. to-morrow.

As will be seen by an advertisement in another part of this issue, Mr. L. Webster will be in charge of the local offices of the Joint Telegraph Companies during the absence of Mr. Walter Judd, the popular Manager-in-Chief.

New piano repairing machinery, received by W. Robinson & Co.

ABDULLAH, the ex-Sultan of Perak, his family, and followers were amongst the arrivals at Singapore by the M. S. steamer *Perak* from Malacca, in the Seychelles archipelago, on the 25th Inst. Abdullah is for the time being settled in a house in Penconlen Street, but it is expected that he will move on long to a larger residence. During his exile the ex-Sultan has acquired a good command of the English language.

BROADWOOD PIANOS at W. Robinson & Co.

The Russian Imperial *Vladimir Monomach* arrived here from Singapore this afternoon.

THE seventeenth ordinary annual meeting of shareholders of the China Sugar Refining Co., Ltd., will be held at the General Agents' office, Pedder's Street, at noon to-morrow.

THE sale, by public auction, of the plant, goodwill, &c., of "THE HONGKONG TELEGRAPH" is advertised to take place at three o'clock to-morrow afternoon at Mr. J. M. Armstrong's sale rooms, Queen's Road Central.

THE Governor of Formosa, anxious to have a good war-chest, has, according to the Shanghai *Mercury*, been attempting to raise a loan from the merchants and gentry. There, however, have not responded very liberally, and he now announces that the bonds may be used toward paying taxes—after the war is over.

THE majority of the pawn-shops in Tientsin, says the *Mercury*, have had to close their doors, as, owing to the approach of the enemy, everybody is anxious to realise cash for their belongings, to flee to a consequence, the money at their disposal is all used. The rate of interest has been raised, and if the war ceases without their being burned-out, great profit will be the result.

FULL stock of banjos, mandolines, guitars, accordions, strings and fittings of all kinds at W. Robinson & Co.

At 8.30 last night there was an outbreak of fire at No. 212, Queen's Road West—a Chinese eating house. The firemen, under Mr. H. E. Woodhouse, speedily got to work, and succeeded in confining the flames to the one house. The tea-house and kitchen, however, were considerably damaged, and the tea-house, which was sub-let to some other Chinese, was insured for \$5,000—\$3,000 in the Chinese Insurance Company (of which Missat Bibi Kalsaba is the local agent) and \$2,000 in a German firm. The origin of the fire is stated to be, as usual, the dropping of a kerosene lamp.

A TELEGRAM dated Hiroshima, March 12th, says:—A report from Chemsuho states that on the 4th Inst. 130 Korean soldiers, sent out from Hwangju to scout, in company with 150 Japanese, dispatched from Pong-yan, fought and defeated over 200 Tong-haks at Eun-phs, and captured a quantity of arms and provisions. It is said that the rebels are assembling at Ku-wol-san and Chong-ye. According to the statement made by soldiers and officials, who reached O-on-dong via An-ak and Chang-ye, the total number of Tong-haks at Ku-wol-san appears to be about 1,000.

THE many friends in Hongkong of that promising young actor, Mr. F. Caballero, will be interested to learn that he had the good fortune to score, at the recent Manila Jockey Club Race Meeting, no less than 6 first and 5 second places, including two very sensational wins—the Manila Derby and Ladies' Purse. Mr. Caballero's young brother also secured 6 first and four second places, so it is apparent that the two brothers fairly "swept the board." The Manila papers speak most highly of Mr. F. Caballero, who they state is the best rider that ever steered a race to victory on the Manila race-course. We note by the way, that the Manila papers speak most highly of Mr. F. Caballero, who they state is the best rider that ever steered a race to victory on the Manila race-course. We note by the way, that the Manila papers speak most highly of Mr. F. Caballero, who they state is the best rider that ever steered a race to victory on the Manila race-course.

A TELEGRAM dated Seoul, March 18th, states:—Cho G-yen, Minister of War for Korea, who has been ordered by the King to inquire into the condition of the Japanese soldiers after their return to their homes, is stated to be conveyed by the Emperor to the Japanese soldiers. The Emperor has declared war against China for the independence of this Kingdom and the preservation of peace in the East, and the army and navy of the Emperor of Japan have attained great success both on land and sea. Although this is without doubt due to the virtues of the Emperor of Japan, still the loyalty of the army and navy officers and men, must also be taken into account. We, therefore, send our accredited Minister of War, Cho G-yen, to inquire into your condition and to convey our thanks to you all.

In Supreme Court yesterday, before Mr. A. G. Wise, Acting Puisne Judge, an Indian attorney, named Iser Singh brought an action for the recovery of \$700, money loaned to Fazal Dun. Mr. Phillippe appeared for the plaintiff, and Mr. Ed. Robinson for the defendant. The drawing of the jury resulted in the selection of Messrs. F. W. Hall, A. W. Schellhar, and A. Colling. The case lasted some time in examining the different witnesses, again the peculiarity and questionable methods of the Sikh cases stood out in bold relief. As a shrewd observer connected with these cases in Court wisely remarked:—"These Indian soldier cases are generally unsatisfactory, because there is so much dishonest collusion. They give no notes for loan transactions, they keep no receipts, have no trustworthy written memoranda; and they make up their cases and get their associates to back their statements, frequently without much regard to the truth; and they generally carry out their plans in underhand, crafty ways. A will sue B, and sometime afterwards B to get even, will get C to sue A on a cooked-up case and the evidence will generally be so skillfully got up as to make it difficult to defeat injustice." If possible, it would be wise, as has been suggested by this same student of the Court, if action of this kind could be brought only on definite written notes and receipts. As it is religion, superstition, race prejudice, ancient quarrels, etc., so confuse the cases that it is difficult to secure exact and even at times approximate justice. The case yesterday was one depending entirely on the testimony of the witnesses. Plaintiff and two witnesses testified one way; the defendant testified the other way. Defendant claimed action had been brought against him to prevent him and his wife from going away on leave, because his wife had a quarrel with another attorney's wife (a non-commissioned officer's wife). By the Military regulations, if the non-commissioned officer had brought the suit for debt, he would have been Court-martialed; so he argued that a friend to trump up the case and bring the action, as a matter of spite, and thus endeavor to get with the defendant and his wife, who belong to an antagonistic race and religion. Mr. Robinson presented the case of the defendant with much ability. Mr. Phillippe made no special defence, but rested his case on the evidence. His Honor briefly charged the jury that they must rely solely on the evidence, and decide whether the three men were really indebted to the one; that they must not believe there was a conspiracy or that the debt was due; and that although there was no promissory note the law did not require necessary to have one. The jury considered the case ten minutes and decided, notwithstanding the views of His Honor, that the case was not proven, judgment was accordingly given for defendant, with costs. Mr. Robinson's argument was certainly well thought out in an ingenious, plausible way, and evidently carried convincing weight with the jury.

W. ROBINSON & Co., piano builders, tuners and repairs.

THE Manager of the Panjom Mining Co., Ltd., reports that during the month of February 1000 tons of ore were crushed and yielded 457 oz. 7 dwts. of gold.

THE Commissioner of Customs for Kowloon and district notifies that the ports of Tamsui and Keelung are now closed by torpedoes, but the working of cargo is still possible outside Tamsui Bar.

OWING to dense fog having been experienced during the major portion of the voyage from Shanghai the *Empress of China*, which arrived here from Woonsoong this afternoon, was delayed about 24 hours en route.

At a meeting of the "Old Volume" society on Friday, the 5th proximo, at which Dr. Jas. Cantile will preside, Mr. E. F. Skerchley will read a paper on "The customs, legends and superstitions of the Cagayan Solos."

New Comic Song and Dance Albums at W. Robinson & Co.

Now that the port of Newchwang is in the hands of the Japanese, it is believed by the *Shanghai Mercury* that the export of goods to Japan, which was interrupted by the Chinese Government on the outbreak of war, will recommence as soon as the ice breaks up. This trade is a very important one, as an immense quantity of goods are imported into Kobe every year from Newchwang.

THE *Phra Chom Khao*, Captain J. Fowler which arrived here from Bangkok this morning brought a number of distinguished Siamese officials to the Colony, including H.R.H. Prince Bidyalabh and Princesses Suvari Bidyalabh and Samurawaya Bidyalabh; Khung Latbet (Deputy General P.W.D.) and Khun Libcha, Private Secretary to His Royal Highness Prince Bidyalabh. These distinguished personages are staying at the Hongkong Hotel.

THE spoils taken at Newchwang by the Japanese were ascertained to have been 2,138 rifles; 1,518,000 rounds of small-arm ammunition; 1 field gun (infantry); 12 mountain guns (all of Chinese manufacture); 2 excellent guns of medium, of 6-centimetre calibre; 6 Gatling; 216 fuzes; 42 fuzils de rempart; 1,648 boxes of gunpowder; 1,120 koku of rice; 150 koku of barley; 110 koku of Indian corn; horses enough to carry the whole baggage of the army; 80 or 90 tents; horse-shoes 213; a quantity of clothing, fur coats, field evens, and other articles.

THUS the *London People*:—"What an elevating and inspiring spectacle would an intoxicated astronomer be! These scientific star gazers are supposed to be so far above all human weaknesses that ordinary mortals would think all the better of themselves on seeing one of the immortals overcome by drink. In China, however, they take such matters very seriously; and two astronomers at Peking were lately decapitated for getting drunk when they ought to have been looking out for an eclipse of the moon. In vain did the poor fellows protest that they saw two eclipses and a double number of stars; it went their heads." Nothing funny about that; simply old custom!

THE papers state that the Korean Government has entered into a contract with the Nippon Yusen Kaisha, entrusting to the company the work of carrying forward the development of steam communication in Korea. In consideration of the services of the Nippon Yusen Kaisha, the Korean Government has agreed to place three steamers owned by it, the *Kanyohi*, *Kaiyohi* and *Sanyohi*, at the disposal of the Nippon Yusen Kaisha, on condition that the company will undertake the training of Korean seamen. The company has arranged to place young Koreans, after examination, in the Tokyo Commercial Navigation School. In return for this, the Korean Government has consented to allow the Nippon Yusen Kaisha to run steamers between those Korean ports, where the Korean Government has to touch, and also to open new lines to other important points. The company reserves the right to increase the steamers on those lines in case of necessity.

A MEETING of the Legislative Council will be held at 3.30 p.m. to-morrow.

(1) Financial Minutes, Nos. 7, 8 and 9.

(2) Sanitary Bye-laws.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

(1) First reading of a Bill entitled "An Ordinance to enable the Governor-in-Council to restrict the immigration of Chinese in the Colony and for other purposes in connection therewith."
(2) First reading of a Bill entitled "An Ordinance to further amend The Waterworks Ordinance, 1890."
(3) First reading of a Bill entitled "An Ordinance to further amend The Building Ordinance, 1889."
(4) First reading of a Bill entitled "An Ordinance for regulating the licensing of private vehicles."
(5) Committee on the Bill entitled "An Ordinance to amend and consolidate the law relating to the carriage and possession of deadly weapons."

THAT rice is being secretly shipped from Shanghai to the Japanese by Chinese is now becoming beyond doubt. A few days ago, says the *Mercury*, a large comprador firm on Broadway, whose head has been for some years doing business with the connivance of certain high officials, shipped several hundred piculs of rice by two Foochow junk to the Provincial Authorities this goes on, and yet these men, whose characters are well known, manage to escape detection through the aid of the all-powerful law. Of the head of this firm several stories are told of the method of gaining his first start in life, and exceedingly interesting they would be thought were they not so common in Shanghai. Some years ago he was a servant on board a steamboat plying on the lower river. He, by misrepresenting and roguery, he managed to obtain possession of a cargo of plants from a wrecked vessel, the proceeds from which he pocketed, having to pay a petty official a small bribe. On the other occasion, witnessing the carrying of passenger-boats he waited until dark, then cut away the bottom of the junk and took out the treasure on board, leaving the bodies of the occupants to their watery grave, and to-day he is selling to his country's enemies the necessities of life.

THE STRIKE.

The following are some particulars of the latest phases of the strike:—
On the 26th, in front of the P. & O. offices, 72 sturdy, hard-working volunteers from the Rifle Brigade, working at a terrible disadvantage with low trucks, entirely unaided for the purpose, helped the Douglas Co. into the godowns with their goods were at work all day. By the way, what is the matter with the Steamship Co. laying down two streets of the board for the wheels of the truck to run on? It would greatly expedite matters and materially save the strength of the hard-working fellows and make the coolies open their eyes to see the way the goods are moved. But, as it is the Rifle men doing the work, all things considered, deserve much praise.
Wednesday, to-morrow, under guard of the Rifle men, are seeking for Messrs. Douglas Layzell.

From some of the leading merchants we learn that it will probably be some time before the strike ends, and they are preparing to handle their business accordingly, since it is rumoured the coolie Lodging House proprietors and the Chinese Gullies have already put up \$30,000 and are willing to put up much more to maintain the coolie industry, and the coolie is, of course, enjoying the luxury of a first class loaf, squatting on his haunches and humming!—
No wanchow work, Hsiao muchee pay! Big plenty chow Sing-song all day.

THE *Phra Chom Khao* arrived from Bangkok and picked up her mud-hook and left for Canton to discharge her cargo.

In Kowloon "Our Very Own" warriors are guarding the Kowloon Godown coolie houses in MacDonnell Road, memorable as the place where three cases of plague occurred during the epidemic of last year. Over there it was even necessary to erect a camp on the spare piece of land opposite the houses and to keep two sentries on duty, one in MacDonnell Road and the other in Chater Street. Although they are public highways, both Europeans and Chinese, in approaching the houses, are challenged with a stern "Halt! who comes there?" This has given rise to several amusing incidents from a number of natives either in ignorance or guided by the "look see piggin" game.

On our beautiful and usually most serene harbour we find six petty officers of the Royal Navy have been sworn in as police to do duty on the water, on account of the great demand for policemen at Aberdeen and Quarry Bay. On the other side of the island, at Aberdeen, where some of the ships have been forced to discharge into Canton junks, the coolies of the Deck Co. are said to have struck work. And since the police have their hands so full at present in keeping the peace, they have found it necessary to call one officer from every outlying station in the Colony back to Victoria to reinforce the Central Station, where great exertions are continually and successfully made to keep the peace, to make everything move calmly to an early solution of the pending difficulty, as may be seen from the following "Express" issued at noon to-day:—

The following was issued as an "Express" at noon to-day:—Persons wanting to hire Cargo Boats and unable to hire them direct, please apply to the Captain Superintendent of Police.

NOTICE.

HONGKONG GENERAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE. By request a meeting will be held at the Chamber of Commerce, City Hall, to-morrow (Thursday), at 4.30 p.m., to which all persons interested in the present Labour Crisis are invited.

F. HENDERSON, Secretary.

His Excellency the Governor having authorized the employment of prisoners for loading coal, Shipping Firms desirous of employing such labour should apply to the Superintendent, Victoria Gaol, stating the number of prisoners required, the wharf to embark at and time of arrival there.

Applications should be made by letter, if possible, on the day previous to that on which the prisoners are required.

H. B. LETHBRIDGE, Superintendent.

A SEQUEL OF THE MATRIMONIAL SCANDAL.

(Before Mr. Geo. Jamison, Acting Chief Justice.)
Shanghai, March 22nd.

REEKS v. REEKS AND RUTTONJEE. BANKRUPTCY OF THE CO-RESPONDENT.

Byram Ruttonjee, the co-respondent in the recent matrimonial suit, Reeks v. Reeks and Ruttonjee, appeared on a judgment summons to be examined as to his means of satisfying the decree for Tls. 3,000 and costs which was given against him last week, but with which he has not yet complied.

Mr. F. Ellis appeared for the petitioner and Mr. J. C. Hanson for the co-respondent. The respondent was not represented.
At the opening of the proceedings Mr. Hanson said he had just received instructions from his client to present a petition in bankruptcy, and as Mr. Ruttonjee would be bound to undergo a public examination as to his means, when the receiving order was made, the learned Counsel suggested that it was not altogether necessary to put the respondent into the witness box at present.

His Lordship—Have you presented the petition?
Mr. Hanson—I have got it now and I can hand it in. I have only just been instructed.

His Lordship—What do you say Mr. Ellis?
Mr. Ellis—I propose, my Lord, to examine Mr. Ruttonjee now as to his ability to satisfy the judgment given against him the other day.

His Lordship—Very well, you have the right, of course, Mr. Ellis. I would like to ask him some questions, notwithstanding the bankruptcy; but if you think it is unnecessary to occupy your time at the present stage, of course I will not do so.

His Lordship—I am entirely at your service if you think anything is to be gained by it. The presentation of the petition does not interfere with your right to question him.

Mr. Ellis—Yes, my Lord, I would like to ask him some questions, notwithstanding the bankruptcy; but if you think it is unnecessary to occupy your time at the present stage, of course I will not do so.

His Lordship—That is so, but it is for Mr. Ellis to say whether he would like to question him now.

Mr. Ellis—I would like to see Mr. Ruttonjee in the witness box.

His Lordship—Very well, he can be sworn. The presentation of the petition will stop any order being made, but you can proceed with your questions.

The co-respondent then entered the witness box and was sworn. He appeared to be very weak and ill, but nevertheless he gave his answers quietly and without hesitation.

Mr. Ellis—Your name is Byram Ruttonjee?
The Co-Respondent—Yes.
Mr. Ellis—What are you? Well, I do not know what I am now. I used to be a shareholder.

Mr. Ellis—Where do you live? At the Club Chambers.

Mr. Ellis—You know, I suppose, what you have been brought here for? Yes.
Mr. Ellis—What have you to say? I have no means to pay the order.

Mr. Ellis—Have you any ready cash? I have about Tls. 70 on my credit on an account in the Bank, and I have a debit balance on another account.
Mr. Ellis—You say you live at Club Chambers? Yes.
Mr. Ellis—How many rooms do you occupy? A suite of two.
Mr. Ellis—Are both of these rooms furnished? Partly.
Mr. Ellis—What is the value of the furniture? I hardly know, about \$100 perhaps.
Mr. Ellis—Is the furniture insured? Yes.
Mr. Ellis—For how much? Tls. 2,000.
Mr. Ellis—And it is only worth \$100? Yes, but the insurance policy is an old one taken out when I had a great deal more furniture.

Mr. Ellis—When did you take out the policy? I took it out first, I think, in 1893 or 1891.
Mr. Ellis—And how long is it that the furniture has only been worth \$100?—Since the end of 1893.

Mr. Ellis—And you have since been able to pay the premium on a policy for Tls. 2,000?—Yes, in fact it was Tls. 3,000 before, but I cancelled Tls. 1,000 and sold off most of my effects, keeping only a few things that were necessary. This was in the end of 1893.
Mr. Ellis—You publish a weekly share report?—I did.
Mr. Ellis—When did you cease to publish it?—Last week.

Mr. Ellis—What was the annual subscription to this weekly share report?—Well, I used to charge one mace.

Mr. Ellis—How much would I have to pay a year supposing I wanted to become a subscriber?—52 weeks; 52 mace, that is Tls. 5.20.
Mr. Ellis—How many subscribers had you?—Witness—Paying subscribers? About 100 or 150.

Mr. Ellis—Have you any books in which you enter the names of those subscribers? No, the publishers have.

Mr. Ellis—Who were the publishers of the report. The *North-China Herald* office.
Mr. Ellis—Have all the subscriptions been paid? No, not all.

Mr. Ellis—How many are outstanding? I have not collected the money, that is the majority of the subscriptions are uncollected.

Mr. Ellis—I suppose you could tell us, if required, the names of the subscribers who have not paid? Yes, I did not charge people of the same calling as myself.

Mr. Ellis—What I want to know is how many people do pay? I cannot tell you off-hand. I should say about 150.

Mr. Ellis—And the majority have not paid this year's subscription yet? I do not think I am entitled to this year's subscriptions.

Mr. Ellis—Well, I mean they have not paid up to date? There are only ten or twelve weeks to be paid for this year.

Mr. Ellis—And last year everyone paid? No, only half, up to June. For this year nobody has paid.

Mr. Ellis—And for last year you say, half have not paid? I am talking of last year all the time.

Mr. Ellis—Does "nobody" owe you money? No, unfortunately.

Mr. Ellis—Do you propose to continue your business here in Shanghai? No.

Mr. Ellis—What do you propose to do? I do not know yet what I will do.

Mr. Ellis—Have you made any arrangements with regard to your business; have you arranged with anyone to take over the business? We each have our own constituents who remain with us, but when I am finished anyone can step in and take

3. If any person who opens or keeps open any common lodging house contrary to the provisions of section 73 of the Public Health Ordinance, 1887, cannot be found, or if the keeper of any common lodging house, which is opened or kept open contrary to the provisions of the Ordinance, is absent from the colony, the householder, as defined by the Public Health Ordinance, 1887, shall be deemed to be the person who opens or keeps open such house and shall be liable accordingly.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

The following is a full and carefully revised report of the proceedings at a meeting of the Legislative Council held yesterday afternoon at which were present:—His Excellency the Governor, Sir William Robinson, K.C.M.G.; Mr. J. H. Stewart Lockhart (Colonial Secretary); Mr. A. J. Leach (Acting Attorney-General); Mr. F. M. Cooper (Director of Public Works); Comdr. R. M. Ramsey, R.N. (Harbour Master); Mr. A. M. Thomson (Acting Colonial Treasurer); Dr. Ho Kai, Messrs. J. L. Kewell, C. P. Chiver, A. McConachie and E. R. Bellios, C.M.G., unofficial members, and Mr. A. Seth, Clerk of Council.

THE NEW COLONIAL SECRETARY.

His Excellency the Governor, having taken the opportunity to inform you that in accordance with the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee, and having regard to his valuable services in this colony, the Secretary of State has been pleased to appoint Mr. J. H. Stewart Lockhart Colonial Secretary. Whilst we all regret the cause of the retirement of that very able officer, Sir George O'Brien, I am sure you will join with me in congratulating Mr. Stewart Lockhart upon his appointment, and in expressing the hope that he will fill the office to which he has been promoted worthily and successfully (applause).

The Colonial Secretary, having taken the oath, said:—I have to thank your Excellency for the kind words in which you have referred to my appointment as Colonial Secretary, and the members of the Council for the manner in which your remarks have been received. I can only say that my one desire in the future will be—as it has been in the past—to perform my duties to the best of my ability and to do everything in my power to further the interests and promote the welfare of this colony, in which the whole of my official career has been spent and which has been kind to me in many ways, and to which I am very firmly attached (applause).

THE COOLIE STRIKE.

His Excellency the Governor, on the order of the day, read the first reading of a Bill entitled an Ordinance to amend the Public Health Ordinance, 1887, in relation to Common Lodging Houses. The Acting Attorney-General will presently explain to you the *raison d'être* of this Bill and the necessity which exists for passing it through its various stages this afternoon. Before he does so, I will, with your permission, say a few words with reference to the existing state of affairs. It is somewhat serious, and requires your attention. I consider it my duty to draw your attention to it, and to point out the danger of the Chinese labourers now on strike. They must either have been wilfully misled by the lodging house keepers, in respect to the registration of Common Lodging Houses, or they themselves have wilfully misunderstood the object of the regulations passed by this Council at its last meeting. As you know perfectly well, the object of these regulations was not to put the way for a strike, but to protect the public health and to make their houses and surroundings more healthy and comfortable than they are, and to protect the public health from any recurrence of the bubonic plague or any invasion of the colony by any epidemic whatever. The Government has taken up its position and it does not intend to abandon it. I consider it would be weak and criminal to do so, and I am glad to hear from all sides that the mercantile community intends to support the Government in this matter through thick and thin (applause). No doubt you will remember that in my despatch, 15th of 1901 June, which was laid on this table, I referred to the measures to be taken with a view to preventing a possible recurrence of the plague. I said these measures would be drastic. I said they might possibly lead to an increase in the rents, to an increase in the cost of living, and perhaps cause a general rise of wages. If these regulations or this Ordinance we propose to pass to-day will cause any increase in rents, doubtless an application from the labouring classes will be received for a general increase of wages, and I believe that it is a matter which is very easily adjusted. But it is a matter purely between employers of labour and the labourers themselves, and does not interfere with or affect the regulations of the Government which it is intended to enforce against Common Lodging Houses. I said quite sure that these people on strike will be the immediate sufferers in any case. Happily the Military, Naval and Civil authorities have combined, and can put from 2,000 to 3,000 labourers into the field, and it is within the means of merchants to telegraph to Swatow and Amoy for more labourers, who, if they came here, will deprive the existing men of all hope of employment in the future. I should be very glad if Dr. Ho Kai, who represents the Chinese, would take an opportunity of interviewing the respectable Chinese merchants and ask them to endeavour to persuade these men to abandon the foolish and shortsighted policy which they have decided to adopt. They may rely upon the Government treating them fairly, and the Government will rely upon the fact that the Government intends to carry into effect the sanitary measures included in these regulations, and which have been approved by the Executive Council and the Legislative Council also. I will now ask the Acting Attorney-General to introduce the Bill.

THE NEW BILL PASSED.

The Acting Attorney-General, in moving the first reading of this Bill, should like first of all to very briefly review the circumstances under which it has become necessary to alter the law. The Public Health Ordinance, among other provisions, aimed at stopping overcrowding, and by section 73 it aimed at stopping overcrowding, especially in common lodging houses, and laid down that no person should keep open a common lodging house unless the house is registered, and the keeper thereof is licensed by the Registrar-General. The keeper, under the definition clause, meaning any person licensed to keep open a lodging house. By Ordinance 26 of 1890 that section is amended, and power is given to the Sanitary Board to make by-laws with regard to the licensing of common lodging houses. The by-laws were duly made, but the date of their coming into operation was postponed from time to time, until, I think, the end of last year, when it was determined that the by-laws and the provisions with regard to overcrowding of lodging houses, especially having regard to the advent of the plague, should come into force, and should be strictly put into force. Now, Sir, the Captain Superintendent of Police undertook the duties or a portion of the duties of enforcing the registration, or enforcing the law against, I should say, the keepers of these houses whether licensed or not, and making them conform to the by-laws under the Ordinance.

When he came to actually attempt to prosecute the keepers, or those who kept open these houses because there is a definition between these two classes of persons—he found very great difficulties in the way. The first difficulty he found was that the keepers—I use the word keepers under the definition clause—those persons who keep open the houses, had run away, and all the chief men could not be got at. In several instances some of the men, or the head coolies who appeared to be keeping the house open, were summoned, and in one or two instances convictions have been made. The difficulties that the prosecution has are almost insurmountable. Another difficulty arises in connection with the definition of common lodging houses. According to the present definition a common lodging house is "any house or part thereof where persons are housed—not being members of the same family—at an amount not exceeding five cents a day, or one dollar a month for each person." You can imagine the difficulty which any prosecution would have in proving any house to come within that definition. How is it possible in the face of the hostile position and in the face of these people running away from the colony, to prove that the coolies only paid five cents a day or one dollar a month? It is a law which has proved impracticable, and in only one or two cases has any evidence been obtained. Take the second section and you will again see what a difficulty presents itself. It is a case of a breach of the law in regard to lodging houses. "Any permanent structure in which employers of labour lodge their employes other than domestic servants, or shopmen, as part of the remuneration given for their services." There again you see it would be impossible for the prosecution to prove that domestic servants or shopmen were lodging in these houses as part of the remuneration which they were receiving for their services. There has become necessary to simplify the definition of common lodging houses, and it is proposed in this Bill to keep out any reference either to the amount paid by these coolies for their lodgings or the remuneration which they receive from their employers. The second material clause of the Bill touches Section 73 of the Ordinance. There are two classes of persons dealt with in this section—persons who keep the houses. I understand that as yet no persons have been licensed under section 73, and I have much as in nearly every case the person who keeps open the house is the person who is actually responsible, I may say that he has fled from the colony, and there is a necessity to look for someone else. Well, of course, it has been a matter of very serious consideration as to who shall be responsible in the absence of the person who keeps open the house, and in case he cannot be found, or in the absence of the licensee, if there is any breach of the by-laws made under the Ordinance, it has been thought that it would only be fair—in a case, say, where there is a person who keeps open a house and cannot be found—that you should come down in such an instance on the householder as defined by the Ordinance; or where a house has been licensed and there has been a breach of the law and the keeper has fled from the law, that you should come down similarly upon the householder. The householder, for the purposes of this Ordinance, is the actual tenant or occupier of any building, and in the case where there is no such person the immediate landlord, and in the case of corporations and companies the secretary thereof. I do not think it would be any real hardship. Somebody must be made responsible for the maintenance of the law with regard to overcrowding. The object is to keep these houses in a sanitary condition, and especially with a view to the possible advent of plague in the near future. It is highly essential that somebody should be made responsible for the proper number of persons inhabiting these common lodging houses. I think, Sir, it is manifest that during the last few years the Chinese—do not, of course, refer to the higher classes—but the chief coolies and others have stirred the men up and harangued against the law in the hope of getting the Government to put its foot down, and put it down firmly. If the men do not like the law, the sooner they leave the colony the better. Of course, this action of the Government must in some extent tell against the trade of the colony, but, I think, I may say with confidence that where you touch their pockets by enforcing the law or by getting them to leave the colony, you will find that the inconvenience to the trade will only be temporary. With these remarks I beg to move the first reading of the Bill.

The Colonial Secretary—I beg to second that. After the remarks of your Excellency and the full explanation of the hon. the Acting Attorney-General, there is not very much left for me to say upon the subject. I am sure that every member of this Council will be agreed that it is absolutely necessary that steps should be taken and that nothing should be left undone to carry out the object which the Government had in view in this matter. I am sure the whole of this community will read with great satisfaction the remarks made by your Excellency that it was the intention of the Government to stand firm in this matter and not to allow the coolies to have the upper hand. To my mind this is one of the most extraordinary disputes in the history of labour. There are unfortunately many strikes in England and elsewhere, and there is always some reason for them. But here we have a large number of coolies without any actual grievance and without being able to formulate any grievance. There are strikes in all parts of the world, and there is always some grievance, but in the case of these coolies it is impossible for them to formulate any grievance. Under these circumstances I feel certain there will be no hesitation on the part of the members of this Council in supporting the Bill, the first reading of which I have now the honour to second. As the hon. the Acting Attorney-General has pointed out, it is absolutely necessary that somebody should be made responsible with regard to these common lodging houses. Under the old law it has been found that directly the head coolie chooses to move into Chinese territory, the law becomes a dead letter. If the householder as defined by the Ordinance does not wish his house to be used as a common lodging house he has the remedy in his own hands. I am quite sure that householders will show a public spirit in this matter, and will come forward and support the Government in trying to bring about a satisfactory settlement in this matter (applause). Bill read a first time.

The standing orders were suspended and the Bill read a second time. The Council went into Committee, and the Bill was read clause by clause and a ballot taken made. The Council then resumed. Dr. Ho Kai—Before the Bill is passed I think I ought to say a few words. I have not opposed this Ordinance to-day, not because I think all the sections are quite just and fair—in fact I think certain sections are harsh upon the householder. I think the Government have been brought on by the coolies themselves, and it is necessary for the Government to pass an Ordinance of this kind to deal with the matter. But I can assure your Excellency that I, as representative of the Chinese in this Council, together with many other persons—Mr. Ho Kai and others connected with the Chinese—have for a long time been reasoning with these coolies.

I have explained to their head men thoroughly the intentions of the Government and the effect of these by-laws, and have gone so far as to personally assure them by written documents that should at any time the Government wish to take advantage of these by-laws and to impose a poll tax upon the coolies, we as representatives of them in this colony, would be personally liable to them. We did this so as to show them in the strongest manner we possibly could that there was no intention on the part of the Government to impose anything like poll tax upon them (hear, hear). That we have not succeeded in persuading them is a matter for regret, and although we have not succeeded so far, I can assure your Excellency and this Council that we, as representatives of the Chinese, will not cease our efforts to bring about a change in the present state of affairs, which we will deprecate. In some cases the men have been amenable to reason. Still, as I say, we will not cease our work, and you may rely upon this, that those Chinese who have come to the help of the Government hitherto will render to the Government their loyal support on this occasion (applause).

SUPREME COURT.

IN APPELLATE JURISDICTION.

(Before the Full Court.)

March 26th.

TANG KIT SHANG vs. NG PAK TO.

Mr. J. J. Francis, Q.C., instructed by Mr. H. L. Denny, appeared for Ng Pak To, the appellant, and Mr. A. J. Leach, Q.C., instructed by Messrs. Johnson, Stokes & Master, for Tang Kit Shing, the respondent.

The Chief Justice delivered judgment as follows:—This is an appeal to the Full Court by the defendant in the above suit against a judgment given against him for \$200 and costs. It appeared that at the time the \$200 was lent to him he was under 21, although he was over that age when the writ of summons was issued. The money was not lent for the purpose of necessities, and if he could set up a plea of infancy in the Supreme Court, sitting in the exercise of its Summary Jurisdiction, he would have a good defence. The learned Judge held that plea could not be set up in Summary Jurisdiction and gave judgment against the defendant. Thereupon the defendant appealed. The appeal is on a case stated by the parties under section 44 of the Supreme Court Summary Jurisdiction Ordinance, 1873, and the question of law which the Full Court has to decide is:—(1) Whether section 11 of the Ordinance 14 of 1873 does away with the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in the exercise of its Summary Jurisdiction, and (2) whether such section applies to procedure only by enabling an infant to sue or be sued without a next friend or guardian *ad litem*. The words of section 11 are as follows:—"No person shall be precluded or exempted from suing or being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding \$1,000, by reason of his not having attained the full age of 21 years or by reason of coverture where the husband shall not be precluded or exempted from suing or being sued before us the relevant words are as follows:—"No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of twenty-one years." Mr. Francis, Q.C., for the appellant contended, in substance, that those words really meant only this—that it was not necessary to appoint a guardian *ad litem* where an infant was sued in the Summary Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Mr. Leach, Q.C., with whom was Mr. Sharp, for the respondent, contended the true interpretation of the words was that they did away with the plea of infancy in summary jurisdiction and that such a defence could not be there set up. When the words of this section are traced back in the local Ordinances it will be found that they occur as far back as in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845. That was an Ordinance to invest the Supreme Court with summary jurisdiction in certain cases, and recited that "it was expedient that debts and damages of a small and trifling amount should be recoverable in the Supreme Court in a summary and expeditious manner." It conferred the summary jurisdiction in certain cases not exceeding \$100 and it contained a proviso precisely similar to section 11 of Ordinance 14 of 1873. The limit in Summary Jurisdiction had risen between 1845 and 1873 from \$100 to \$1,000, but in no way did the words of section 11 mean precisely the same as those of the proviso in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845; and the meaning I attach to that proviso is that it prevents the question being raised in the Summary Jurisdiction whether plaintiff or defendant has attained the full age of 21 years or whether the plaintiff or defendant is a married woman, where the husband is not resident in the colony. Debts of infancy and coverture are, in the English law, outside of summary jurisdiction, and which special notice has to be given, and to enable the truth of such plea to be tested the county court rules required "the place and date of birth" to be set out in the notice of special defence of infancy, while they also required the place and date of marriage together "with the Christian names and surname of the husband and his address and description so far as known to be stated in the notice of special defence." One can well understand the difficulty in this colony in the year 1845 of testing the truth of a plea of infancy where the place of birth would obviously not be Hongkong, which had then been recently ceded to England. The like difficulty would arise as to the plea of coverture, where the husband was not resident in Hongkong. I can, therefore, see at least no adequate impossibility in the face of this difficulty and considering the balance of convenience, the Legislature should, in case of trifling amounts, prevent the raising of these defences at all. When, moreover, section 23 of Ordinance 14 of 1873, which deals with notice of special defences, is referred to, one would certainly have expected to find "infancy" and "coverture" specially mentioned among the others, unless it had been intended that they were not to be set up at all, owing to section 11. Again, while the sections beginning with "No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of 21 years or by reason of coverture where the husband shall not be precluded or exempted from suing or being sued before us the relevant words are as follows:—"No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of twenty-one years." Mr. Francis, Q.C., for the appellant contended, in substance, that those words really meant only this—that it was not necessary to appoint a guardian *ad litem* where an infant was sued in the Summary Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Mr. Leach, Q.C., with whom was Mr. Sharp, for the respondent, contended the true interpretation of the words was that they did away with the plea of infancy in summary jurisdiction and that such a defence could not be there set up. When the words of this section are traced back in the local Ordinances it will be found that they occur as far back as in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845. That was an Ordinance to invest the Supreme Court with summary jurisdiction in certain cases, and recited that "it was expedient that debts and damages of a small and trifling amount should be recoverable in the Supreme Court in a summary and expeditious manner." It conferred the summary jurisdiction in certain cases not exceeding \$100 and it contained a proviso precisely similar to section 11 of Ordinance 14 of 1873. The limit in Summary Jurisdiction had risen between 1845 and 1873 from \$100 to \$1,000, but in no way did the words of section 11 mean precisely the same as those of the proviso in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845; and the meaning I attach to that proviso is that it prevents the question being raised in the Summary Jurisdiction whether plaintiff or defendant has attained the full age of 21 years or whether the plaintiff or defendant is a married woman, where the husband is not resident in the colony. Debts of infancy and coverture are, in the English law, outside of summary jurisdiction, and which special notice has to be given, and to enable the truth of such plea to be tested the county court rules required "the place and date of birth" to be set out in the notice of special defence of infancy, while they also required the place and date of marriage together "with the Christian names and surname of the husband and his address and description so far as known to be stated in the notice of special defence." One can well understand the difficulty in this colony in the year 1845 of testing the truth of a plea of infancy where the place of birth would obviously not be Hongkong, which had then been recently ceded to England. The like difficulty would arise as to the plea of coverture, where the husband was not resident in Hongkong. I can, therefore, see at least no adequate impossibility in the face of this difficulty and considering the balance of convenience, the Legislature should, in case of trifling amounts, prevent the raising of these defences at all. When, moreover, section 23 of Ordinance 14 of 1873, which deals with notice of special defences, is referred to, one would certainly have expected to find "infancy" and "coverture" specially mentioned among the others, unless it had been intended that they were not to be set up at all, owing to section 11. Again, while the sections beginning with "No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of 21 years or by reason of coverture where the husband shall not be precluded or exempted from suing or being sued before us the relevant words are as follows:—"No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of twenty-one years." Mr. Francis, Q.C., for the appellant contended, in substance, that those words really meant only this—that it was not necessary to appoint a guardian *ad litem* where an infant was sued in the Summary Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Mr. Leach, Q.C., with whom was Mr. Sharp, for the respondent, contended the true interpretation of the words was that they did away with the plea of infancy in summary jurisdiction and that such a defence could not be there set up. When the words of this section are traced back in the local Ordinances it will be found that they occur as far back as in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845. That was an Ordinance to invest the Supreme Court with summary jurisdiction in certain cases, and recited that "it was expedient that debts and damages of a small and trifling amount should be recoverable in the Supreme Court in a summary and expeditious manner." It conferred the summary jurisdiction in certain cases not exceeding \$100 and it contained a proviso precisely similar to section 11 of Ordinance 14 of 1873. The limit in Summary Jurisdiction had risen between 1845 and 1873 from \$100 to \$1,000, but in no way did the words of section 11 mean precisely the same as those of the proviso in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845; and the meaning I attach to that proviso is that it prevents the question being raised in the Summary Jurisdiction whether plaintiff or defendant has attained the full age of 21 years or whether the plaintiff or defendant is a married woman, where the husband is not resident in the colony. Debts of infancy and coverture are, in the English law, outside of summary jurisdiction, and which special notice has to be given, and to enable the truth of such plea to be tested the county court rules required "the place and date of birth" to be set out in the notice of special defence of infancy, while they also required the place and date of marriage together "with the Christian names and surname of the husband and his address and description so far as known to be stated in the notice of special defence." One can well understand the difficulty in this colony in the year 1845 of testing the truth of a plea of infancy where the place of birth would obviously not be Hongkong, which had then been recently ceded to England. The like difficulty would arise as to the plea of coverture, where the husband was not resident in Hongkong. I can, therefore, see at least no adequate impossibility in the face of this difficulty and considering the balance of convenience, the Legislature should, in case of trifling amounts, prevent the raising of these defences at all. When, moreover, section 23 of Ordinance 14 of 1873, which deals with notice of special defences, is referred to, one would certainly have expected to find "infancy" and "coverture" specially mentioned among the others, unless it had been intended that they were not to be set up at all, owing to section 11. Again, while the sections beginning with "No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of 21 years or by reason of coverture where the husband shall not be precluded or exempted from suing or being sued before us the relevant words are as follows:—"No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of twenty-one years." Mr. Francis, Q.C., for the appellant contended, in substance, that those words really meant only this—that it was not necessary to appoint a guardian *ad litem* where an infant was sued in the Summary Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Mr. Leach, Q.C., with whom was Mr. Sharp, for the respondent, contended the true interpretation of the words was that they did away with the plea of infancy in summary jurisdiction and that such a defence could not be there set up. When the words of this section are traced back in the local Ordinances it will be found that they occur as far back as in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845. That was an Ordinance to invest the Supreme Court with summary jurisdiction in certain cases, and recited that "it was expedient that debts and damages of a small and trifling amount should be recoverable in the Supreme Court in a summary and expeditious manner." It conferred the summary jurisdiction in certain cases not exceeding \$100 and it contained a proviso precisely similar to section 11 of Ordinance 14 of 1873. The limit in Summary Jurisdiction had risen between 1845 and 1873 from \$100 to \$1,000, but in no way did the words of section 11 mean precisely the same as those of the proviso in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845; and the meaning I attach to that proviso is that it prevents the question being raised in the Summary Jurisdiction whether plaintiff or defendant has attained the full age of 21 years or whether the plaintiff or defendant is a married woman, where the husband is not resident in the colony. Debts of infancy and coverture are, in the English law, outside of summary jurisdiction, and which special notice has to be given, and to enable the truth of such plea to be tested the county court rules required "the place and date of birth" to be set out in the notice of special defence of infancy, while they also required the place and date of marriage together "with the Christian names and surname of the husband and his address and description so far as known to be stated in the notice of special defence." One can well understand the difficulty in this colony in the year 1845 of testing the truth of a plea of infancy where the place of birth would obviously not be Hongkong, which had then been recently ceded to England. The like difficulty would arise as to the plea of coverture, where the husband was not resident in Hongkong. I can, therefore, see at least no adequate impossibility in the face of this difficulty and considering the balance of convenience, the Legislature should, in case of trifling amounts, prevent the raising of these defences at all. When, moreover, section 23 of Ordinance 14 of 1873, which deals with notice of special defences, is referred to, one would certainly have expected to find "infancy" and "coverture" specially mentioned among the others, unless it had been intended that they were not to be set up at all, owing to section 11. Again, while the sections beginning with "No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of 21 years or by reason of coverture where the husband shall not be precluded or exempted from suing or being sued before us the relevant words are as follows:—"No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of twenty-one years." Mr. Francis, Q.C., for the appellant contended, in substance, that those words really meant only this—that it was not necessary to appoint a guardian *ad litem* where an infant was sued in the Summary Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Mr. Leach, Q.C., with whom was Mr. Sharp, for the respondent, contended the true interpretation of the words was that they did away with the plea of infancy in summary jurisdiction and that such a defence could not be there set up. When the words of this section are traced back in the local Ordinances it will be found that they occur as far back as in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845. That was an Ordinance to invest the Supreme Court with summary jurisdiction in certain cases, and recited that "it was expedient that debts and damages of a small and trifling amount should be recoverable in the Supreme Court in a summary and expeditious manner." It conferred the summary jurisdiction in certain cases not exceeding \$100 and it contained a proviso precisely similar to section 11 of Ordinance 14 of 1873. The limit in Summary Jurisdiction had risen between 1845 and 1873 from \$100 to \$1,000, but in no way did the words of section 11 mean precisely the same as those of the proviso in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845; and the meaning I attach to that proviso is that it prevents the question being raised in the Summary Jurisdiction whether plaintiff or defendant has attained the full age of 21 years or whether the plaintiff or defendant is a married woman, where the husband is not resident in the colony. Debts of infancy and coverture are, in the English law, outside of summary jurisdiction, and which special notice has to be given, and to enable the truth of such plea to be tested the county court rules required "the place and date of birth" to be set out in the notice of special defence of infancy, while they also required the place and date of marriage together "with the Christian names and surname of the husband and his address and description so far as known to be stated in the notice of special defence." One can well understand the difficulty in this colony in the year 1845 of testing the truth of a plea of infancy where the place of birth would obviously not be Hongkong, which had then been recently ceded to England. The like difficulty would arise as to the plea of coverture, where the husband was not resident in Hongkong. I can, therefore, see at least no adequate impossibility in the face of this difficulty and considering the balance of convenience, the Legislature should, in case of trifling amounts, prevent the raising of these defences at all. When, moreover, section 23 of Ordinance 14 of 1873, which deals with notice of special defences, is referred to, one would certainly have expected to find "infancy" and "coverture" specially mentioned among the others, unless it had been intended that they were not to be set up at all, owing to section 11. Again, while the sections beginning with "No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of 21 years or by reason of coverture where the husband shall not be precluded or exempted from suing or being sued before us the relevant words are as follows:—"No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of twenty-one years." Mr. Francis, Q.C., for the appellant contended, in substance, that those words really meant only this—that it was not necessary to appoint a guardian *ad litem* where an infant was sued in the Summary Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Mr. Leach, Q.C., with whom was Mr. Sharp, for the respondent, contended the true interpretation of the words was that they did away with the plea of infancy in summary jurisdiction and that such a defence could not be there set up. When the words of this section are traced back in the local Ordinances it will be found that they occur as far back as in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845. That was an Ordinance to invest the Supreme Court with summary jurisdiction in certain cases, and recited that "it was expedient that debts and damages of a small and trifling amount should be recoverable in the Supreme Court in a summary and expeditious manner." It conferred the summary jurisdiction in certain cases not exceeding \$100 and it contained a proviso precisely similar to section 11 of Ordinance 14 of 1873. The limit in Summary Jurisdiction had risen between 1845 and 1873 from \$100 to \$1,000, but in no way did the words of section 11 mean precisely the same as those of the proviso in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845; and the meaning I attach to that proviso is that it prevents the question being raised in the Summary Jurisdiction whether plaintiff or defendant has attained the full age of 21 years or whether the plaintiff or defendant is a married woman, where the husband is not resident in the colony. Debts of infancy and coverture are, in the English law, outside of summary jurisdiction, and which special notice has to be given, and to enable the truth of such plea to be tested the county court rules required "the place and date of birth" to be set out in the notice of special defence of infancy, while they also required the place and date of marriage together "with the Christian names and surname of the husband and his address and description so far as known to be stated in the notice of special defence." One can well understand the difficulty in this colony in the year 1845 of testing the truth of a plea of infancy where the place of birth would obviously not be Hongkong, which had then been recently ceded to England. The like difficulty would arise as to the plea of coverture, where the husband was not resident in Hongkong. I can, therefore, see at least no adequate impossibility in the face of this difficulty and considering the balance of convenience, the Legislature should, in case of trifling amounts, prevent the raising of these defences at all. When, moreover, section 23 of Ordinance 14 of 1873, which deals with notice of special defences, is referred to, one would certainly have expected to find "infancy" and "coverture" specially mentioned among the others, unless it had been intended that they were not to be set up at all, owing to section 11. Again, while the sections beginning with "No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of 21 years or by reason of coverture where the husband shall not be precluded or exempted from suing or being sued before us the relevant words are as follows:—"No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of twenty-one years." Mr. Francis, Q.C., for the appellant contended, in substance, that those words really meant only this—that it was not necessary to appoint a guardian *ad litem* where an infant was sued in the Summary Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Mr. Leach, Q.C., with whom was Mr. Sharp, for the respondent, contended the true interpretation of the words was that they did away with the plea of infancy in summary jurisdiction and that such a defence could not be there set up. When the words of this section are traced back in the local Ordinances it will be found that they occur as far back as in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845. That was an Ordinance to invest the Supreme Court with summary jurisdiction in certain cases, and recited that "it was expedient that debts and damages of a small and trifling amount should be recoverable in the Supreme Court in a summary and expeditious manner." It conferred the summary jurisdiction in certain cases not exceeding \$100 and it contained a proviso precisely similar to section 11 of Ordinance 14 of 1873. The limit in Summary Jurisdiction had risen between 1845 and 1873 from \$100 to \$1,000, but in no way did the words of section 11 mean precisely the same as those of the proviso in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845; and the meaning I attach to that proviso is that it prevents the question being raised in the Summary Jurisdiction whether plaintiff or defendant has attained the full age of 21 years or whether the plaintiff or defendant is a married woman, where the husband is not resident in the colony. Debts of infancy and coverture are, in the English law, outside of summary jurisdiction, and which special notice has to be given, and to enable the truth of such plea to be tested the county court rules required "the place and date of birth" to be set out in the notice of special defence of infancy, while they also required the place and date of marriage together "with the Christian names and surname of the husband and his address and description so far as known to be stated in the notice of special defence." One can well understand the difficulty in this colony in the year 1845 of testing the truth of a plea of infancy where the place of birth would obviously not be Hongkong, which had then been recently ceded to England. The like difficulty would arise as to the plea of coverture, where the husband was not resident in Hongkong. I can, therefore, see at least no adequate impossibility in the face of this difficulty and considering the balance of convenience, the Legislature should, in case of trifling amounts, prevent the raising of these defences at all. When, moreover, section 23 of Ordinance 14 of 1873, which deals with notice of special defences, is referred to, one would certainly have expected to find "infancy" and "coverture" specially mentioned among the others, unless it had been intended that they were not to be set up at all, owing to section 11. Again, while the sections beginning with "No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of 21 years or by reason of coverture where the husband shall not be precluded or exempted from suing or being sued before us the relevant words are as follows:—"No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of twenty-one years." Mr. Francis, Q.C., for the appellant contended, in substance, that those words really meant only this—that it was not necessary to appoint a guardian *ad litem* where an infant was sued in the Summary Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Mr. Leach, Q.C., with whom was Mr. Sharp, for the respondent, contended the true interpretation of the words was that they did away with the plea of infancy in summary jurisdiction and that such a defence could not be there set up. When the words of this section are traced back in the local Ordinances it will be found that they occur as far back as in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845. That was an Ordinance to invest the Supreme Court with summary jurisdiction in certain cases, and recited that "it was expedient that debts and damages of a small and trifling amount should be recoverable in the Supreme Court in a summary and expeditious manner." It conferred the summary jurisdiction in certain cases not exceeding \$100 and it contained a proviso precisely similar to section 11 of Ordinance 14 of 1873. The limit in Summary Jurisdiction had risen between 1845 and 1873 from \$100 to \$1,000, but in no way did the words of section 11 mean precisely the same as those of the proviso in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845; and the meaning I attach to that proviso is that it prevents the question being raised in the Summary Jurisdiction whether plaintiff or defendant has attained the full age of 21 years or whether the plaintiff or defendant is a married woman, where the husband is not resident in the colony. Debts of infancy and coverture are, in the English law, outside of summary jurisdiction, and which special notice has to be given, and to enable the truth of such plea to be tested the county court rules required "the place and date of birth" to be set out in the notice of special defence of infancy, while they also required the place and date of marriage together "with the Christian names and surname of the husband and his address and description so far as known to be stated in the notice of special defence." One can well understand the difficulty in this colony in the year 1845 of testing the truth of a plea of infancy where the place of birth would obviously not be Hongkong, which had then been recently ceded to England. The like difficulty would arise as to the plea of coverture, where the husband was not resident in Hongkong. I can, therefore, see at least no adequate impossibility in the face of this difficulty and considering the balance of convenience, the Legislature should, in case of trifling amounts, prevent the raising of these defences at all. When, moreover, section 23 of Ordinance 14 of 1873, which deals with notice of special defences, is referred to, one would certainly have expected to find "infancy" and "coverture" specially mentioned among the others, unless it had been intended that they were not to be set up at all, owing to section 11. Again, while the sections beginning with "No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of 21 years or by reason of coverture where the husband shall not be precluded or exempted from suing or being sued before us the relevant words are as follows:—"No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of twenty-one years." Mr. Francis, Q.C., for the appellant contended, in substance, that those words really meant only this—that it was not necessary to appoint a guardian *ad litem* where an infant was sued in the Summary Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Mr. Leach, Q.C., with whom was Mr. Sharp, for the respondent, contended the true interpretation of the words was that they did away with the plea of infancy in summary jurisdiction and that such a defence could not be there set up. When the words of this section are traced back in the local Ordinances it will be found that they occur as far back as in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845. That was an Ordinance to invest the Supreme Court with summary jurisdiction in certain cases, and recited that "it was expedient that debts and damages of a small and trifling amount should be recoverable in the Supreme Court in a summary and expeditious manner." It conferred the summary jurisdiction in certain cases not exceeding \$100 and it contained a proviso precisely similar to section 11 of Ordinance 14 of 1873. The limit in Summary Jurisdiction had risen between 1845 and 1873 from \$100 to \$1,000, but in no way did the words of section 11 mean precisely the same as those of the proviso in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845; and the meaning I attach to that proviso is that it prevents the question being raised in the Summary Jurisdiction whether plaintiff or defendant has attained the full age of 21 years or whether the plaintiff or defendant is a married woman, where the husband is not resident in the colony. Debts of infancy and coverture are, in the English law, outside of summary jurisdiction, and which special notice has to be given, and to enable the truth of such plea to be tested the county court rules required "the place and date of birth" to be set out in the notice of special defence of infancy, while they also required the place and date of marriage together "with the Christian names and surname of the husband and his address and description so far as known to be stated in the notice of special defence." One can well understand the difficulty in this colony in the year 1845 of testing the truth of a plea of infancy where the place of birth would obviously not be Hongkong, which had then been recently ceded to England. The like difficulty would arise as to the plea of coverture, where the husband was not resident in Hongkong. I can, therefore, see at least no adequate impossibility in the face of this difficulty and considering the balance of convenience, the Legislature should, in case of trifling amounts, prevent the raising of these defences at all. When, moreover, section 23 of Ordinance 14 of 1873, which deals with notice of special defences, is referred to, one would certainly have expected to find "infancy" and "coverture" specially mentioned among the others, unless it had been intended that they were not to be set up at all, owing to section 11. Again, while the sections beginning with "No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of 21 years or by reason of coverture where the husband shall not be precluded or exempted from suing or being sued before us the relevant words are as follows:—"No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of twenty-one years." Mr. Francis, Q.C., for the appellant contended, in substance, that those words really meant only this—that it was not necessary to appoint a guardian *ad litem* where an infant was sued in the Summary Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Mr. Leach, Q.C., with whom was Mr. Sharp, for the respondent, contended the true interpretation of the words was that they did away with the plea of infancy in summary jurisdiction and that such a defence could not be there set up. When the words of this section are traced back in the local Ordinances it will be found that they occur as far back as in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845. That was an Ordinance to invest the Supreme Court with summary jurisdiction in certain cases, and recited that "it was expedient that debts and damages of a small and trifling amount should be recoverable in the Supreme Court in a summary and expeditious manner." It conferred the summary jurisdiction in certain cases not exceeding \$100 and it contained a proviso precisely similar to section 11 of Ordinance 14 of 1873. The limit in Summary Jurisdiction had risen between 1845 and 1873 from \$100 to \$1,000, but in no way did the words of section 11 mean precisely the same as those of the proviso in section 1 of Ordinance 9 of 1845; and the meaning I attach to that proviso is that it prevents the question being raised in the Summary Jurisdiction whether plaintiff or defendant has attained the full age of 21 years or whether the plaintiff or defendant is a married woman, where the husband is not resident in the colony. Debts of infancy and coverture are, in the English law, outside of summary jurisdiction, and which special notice has to be given, and to enable the truth of such plea to be tested the county court rules required "the place and date of birth" to be set out in the notice of special defence of infancy, while they also required the place and date of marriage together "with the Christian names and surname of the husband and his address and description so far as known to be stated in the notice of special defence." One can well understand the difficulty in this colony in the year 1845 of testing the truth of a plea of infancy where the place of birth would obviously not be Hongkong, which had then been recently ceded to England. The like difficulty would arise as to the plea of coverture, where the husband was not resident in Hongkong. I can, therefore, see at least no adequate impossibility in the face of this difficulty and considering the balance of convenience, the Legislature should, in case of trifling amounts, prevent the raising of these defences at all. When, moreover, section 23 of Ordinance 14 of 1873, which deals with notice of special defences, is referred to, one would certainly have expected to find "infancy" and "coverture" specially mentioned among the others, unless it had been intended that they were not to be set up at all, owing to section 11. Again, while the sections beginning with "No person shall be precluded or exempted from being sued for any debt or damages not exceeding one thousand dollars by reason of his not having attained the full age of 21 years or by reason of coverture where the husband shall not be precluded or exempted from suing or being sued before us the relevant words are as follows:—"No

The Share Market.

LATEST QUOTATIONS.

BANKS.

Hongkong and Shanghai Bank—174 per cent.
The National Bank of China, Ltd.—on £8.00
paid up—\$21, sales.
The National Bank of China, Ltd.—Founders
shares, nominal.
The Bank of China, Japan & the Straits, Ltd.—
nominal.
The Bank of China, Japan & the Straits, Ltd.—
Founders' shares—£5, buyers.
Chinese Imperial Loan of 1886—11 per cent.
premium.

MARINE INSURANCES.

Union Insurance Society of Canton—\$157 per
share, buyers.
China Traders' Insurance Company—\$67 per
share, sales and buyers.
North China Insurance—Tis. 212 per share,
buyers.
Caston Insurance Company, Limited—\$160 per
share, buyers.
Yangtze Insurance Association—\$102, buyers.
On Tai Insurance Company, Limited—Tis. 15
per share.
The Straits Insurance Co., Ltd.—\$204 per share,
sellers.

FIRE INSURANCES.

Hongkong Fire Insurance Company—\$175 per
share, buyers.
China Fire Insurance Company—\$78 per share,
buyers.
The Straits Fire Insurance Co., Ltd., \$2 per
share, buyers.
Indo-China Steam Navigation Company, Limited
—\$45, buyers.
Daguerre Steamship Company—\$49, sales and
sellers.

SHIPPING.

Hongkong, Canton, and Macao Steamship Co.—
\$33 per share, sales and sellers.
China and Manila Steam Ship Company—\$60,
sellers.
Indo-China Steam Navigation Company, Limited
—\$45, buyers.
Daguerre Steamship Company—\$49, sales and
sellers.

REFINERIES.

China Sugar Refining Company, Limited—\$135
per share, buyers.
Luzon Sugar Refining Company, Limited—\$48,
buyers.

MINING.

Panlong Mining Co.—(Ordinary)—\$6 per share,
sellers.
Panlong Mining Co.—(Preference)—\$1.75 per
share, buyers.
The Raw Gold Mining Co., Limited—\$41 per
share, sales and buyers.
The New National Gold Mining Co., Limited—
\$7 per share, sales and sellers.
Société Française des Charbonnages du Tonkin
—\$70 per share, sellers.
The Jelebu Mining and Trading Co., Limited—
\$4.25, buyers.

DOCKS, WHARVES AND GODOWNS.

Hongkong and Whampoa Dock Company—91
per cent. premium, buyers.
Geo. Fenwick & Co., Limited—\$15 per share,
buyers.
Hongkong and Kowloon Wharf and Godown
Company—\$39 per share, sales and sellers.
Wanchai Warehouse Co., Ltd.—\$37 per share,
sellers.

HOTELS.

Hongkong Hotel Company—\$9 per share,
buyers.
Hongkong Hotel Co.'s Six per cent. Debentures
—\$67.

LANDS AND BUILDINGS.

The Shumson Hotel Co., Limited—nominal.
The Kowloon Land Investment Co., Limited—
\$0 per share, sellers.
The Hongkong Land Investment Co., Limited—
\$74, sales and buyers.
The West Point Buildings Co., Limited—\$15
per share, buyers.
Humphreys' Estate and Finance Co., Ltd.—\$14
per share, sellers.

DISPENSARIES.

A. S. Watson & Co., Limited—\$94, buyers.
Dakin, Cruickshank & Co., Limited—\$1 per
share, buyers.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hongkong Dairy Farm Co., Limited—\$54 per
share, buyers.
H. G. Brown & Co., Limited—\$5 per share,
sellers.
Hongkong Rope Manufacturing Company,
Limited—\$121 per share, buyers.
Hongkong Gas Company—\$125 per share, buyers.
Hongkong Ice Company—\$76 per share, buyers.
Hongkong and China Bakery Company, Limited
—\$40 per share, sellers.
The Hongkong Brick and Cement Co., Limited—
\$41 per share, buyers.
The Green Island Cement Co.—\$74, buyers.
The Hongkong Electric Light Co., Limited—
\$4.75, sellers.
The Hongkong High-Level Tramway Co.,
Limited—\$70, buyers.
Campbell, Moore & Co., Ltd.—\$4 per share,
sellers.
Bell's Asbestos Eastern Agency, Limited—£1
shares; 15s. paid; \$8.75, buyers.

EXCHANGES.

On London—Bank, T. T. 2 0/3
Bank Bills, on demand 2 0/3
Bank Bills, at 4 months' sight 2 1/4
Credits at 4 months' sight 2 1/4
Documentary Bills, at 4 months' sight 2 1/4
On Paris—
Bank Bills, on demand 2.61
Credits at 4 months' sight 2.67
On India—
T. T. 189 1/2
On Demand 189 1/2
On Shanghai—
Bank, T. T. 7 1/4
Private, 30 days' sight 7 1/4
Sovereigns (Bank's buying rate) 89.45
Silver (per oz.) 29 1/2

MAILS EXPECTED.

THE AUSTRALIAN MAIL.
The E. & A. Steamship Co.'s steamer
Athol, from Australia, left Port Darwin on the
23rd instant, and may be expected here on the
21st proximo.
The Northern Pacific Steamship Co.'s steamer
Victoria left Victoria, B.C., on the 23rd instant
for Yokohama and Hongkong.

STEAMERS EXPECTED.

The Navigators Generale Italiana steamer
Bianco, from Bombay, left Singapore on the
21st instant, and may be expected here to-mor-
row.
The P. & O. S. N. Co.'s steamer Bombay, from
Bombay, left Singapore on the 22nd instant, and
may be expected here on the 29th.
The "Glen" steamer Glenloch, from
Antwerp and London, left Singapore on the 24th
instant, and may be expected here on the 31st.
For Ocean Steamship Co.'s steamer Palawan
left Singapore on the 26th instant, and may be
expected here on the 1st proximo.

The steamer *Argosy* left Bombay on the
afternoon of the 15th instant, and may be
expected here on the 15th proximo.
The P. & O. S. N. Co.'s steamer *Shanghai*
left Singapore for this port on the 21st instant.

VISITORS AT THE HONGKONG HOTEL.

Mr. and Mrs. G. F. Mr. and Mrs. L. H.
Adams. Jerome and maid.
Mr. H. T. Allen. Mr. J. Kinghorn.
Mr. J. H. Barker. Mr. W. Krumm.
Mr. E. Bard. Mr. B. Lethbridge.
Mr. & Mrs. A. Barnes. Mr. Khun Lekha.
H.R.H. Prince Bedyah. Count C. Lerche.
Miss M. de la Nautie. Baron W. Lerche.
and M.P.W. Mr. H. Lewis.
Princess Bedyah. Mr. Hugh MacCallum.
Mr. J. W. Bolles. Mr. J. McWilliams.
Mr. G. C. Bosman. Mr. J. P. Miller.
Mr. B. J. Brotherton. Mr. T. Mitchell.
Mr. W. J. Carter. Mr. J. de Navarre.
Mr. S. W. Cartwright. Col. & Mrs. O'Gorman.
Mr. J. D. Clark. Mrs. O'Gorman.
Capt. and Mrs. Combe. Mrs. W. Parfitt.
and child. Mrs. & Miss C. Phelps.
Mr. H. E. Crawford. Mr. S. Phelps.
Captain Crow. Mr. A. Phillips.
Mr. Disney. Princess Pravassawati.
Mr. W. A. Duff. Mr. Huang Sahit.
Mr. E. G. Fenwick. Princess Sumomaiya.
Mr. G. A. Field. Mr. F. T. Richards.
Mr. Garlick. Mr. Rowbotham.
Mr. Gibson. Mr. Schomburgk.
Mr. Geo. Gottsberger. Senator L. O. Smith.
Mr. J. W. Groves. Miss E. C. Smith.
Mr. S. W. Gunn. Mr. & Mrs. J. P. Thomas
and child.
Mr. C. Harris. Mrs. & Miss Townsend.
Mr. A. Haupt. Mr. M. Van der Velden.
Mr. H. Geo. Head. Mr. W. S. Wyles.
Mr. Hodgins. Mr. W. Wedell.
Mr. A. J. Jackson.

VISITORS AND RESIDENTS AT THE PEAK HOTEL.

Mr. M. G. Allen. Mrs. G. Holmes.
Mr. F. G. Becke. Mr. B. Layton.
Mr. J. A. Becke. Mr. F. D. Maclean.
Mr. J. A. Chaudet. Mr. Medhurst.
Major and Mrs. Moore.
Mr. J. R. Cramble. Mr. J. R. Cramble.
Mr. R. P. Dipple. Mr. H. W. Robertson.
Mr. J. P. Dowling. Mr. Sandilands.
Mr. D. Farquharson. Mr. and Mrs. Sansom.
Mr. & Mrs. A. Findlay. Mr. F. H. Slaghek.
Smith and family. Mrs. A. Smith.
Mr. and Mrs. Goldman. Mr. A. G. Stokes.
Mr. W. S. Harrison. Mr. A. B. Skettow.
Mr. Geo. Holmes. Rev. and Mrs. Vallings.

CHINA COAST METEOROLOGICAL REGISTER.

26th March, 1895.—At 4 p.m.

STATION.	Wind.	Temp.	Bar.	Humid.	Dir.	Force.	Clouds.	Sea.	Vis.
Wanchow.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yantai.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Wangchow.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Shanghai.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Foochow.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Amoy.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Swatow.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Hankow.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yokohama.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Kobe.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Manila.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Cebu.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Calcutta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Bombay.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Colombo.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Singapore.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Penang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Malacca.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Sumatra.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Batavia.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Sourabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Medan.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Belitong.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Langkat.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Padang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Bandung.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Yogyakarta.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Semarang.	SE	78	30.1	85	SE	1	0	0	0
Surabaya.	SE	78	30.1</						